

the plutonium path to a bomb—with concrete and convert that to peaceful use.

Natanz, underneath the mountain that some would have us bomb—unfortunately, it is underneath the mountain—that will become a medical facility monitored 24/7. No. That is Fordow, excuse me, not Natanz. Yet we hear the drumbeat for war over here. They don't want to say they want to have a war, but that is the ultimate conclusion.

If you don't want Iran to have nuclear weapons, this is the best deal we can get, and we amazingly got this deal with the support of Russia, China, and four nations in Europe.

Now, they are already flooding into Iran in anticipation of this deal going forward. They have no intention of going back to the table. The Chinese want the oil. Russians want to sell them weapons. The planes have been totally full coming out of Europe with high-level corporate executives wanting to go into Iran and do business.

No. This is the only alternative before the United States Congress and the only one that can prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon in the short term. Yes, 12, 15 years down the road, we may have to deal with this again. Yet again, 12 or 15 years from now, under this regime, perhaps Iran will have changed. We will see.

So I am proud of this vote, and I think it is the best path. I am also incredibly proud of my vote against popular opinion and such sagacious people as Dick Cheney, John Bolton, and Benjamin Netanyahu about invading Iraq, which has turned the Middle East into an unbelievable mess that will not be undone in my lifetime. ISIS is basically a product of the Iraq war, an invasion by the U.S.

So let's not create even worse problems. Let's take this imperfect agreement, but let's take it because it prevents Iran from having a nuclear weapon and having a weapons race in this incredibly unstable part of the world.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of the Third District of Kansas and on behalf of American people who are counting on us to put their security before the obvious partisan politics of Washington, D.C. I also join a bipartisan majority, leaders of each party in each Chamber, to stand up and be counted as one of the many voices in this country in opposition to the President's deal with Iran.

Like others who plan to oppose the ratification of this deal, I am not opposed to the idea of diplomacy, but I am opposed to the idea of surrender diplomacy. This administration asked us to trust Iran; but as Iran continues to be the largest world state sponsor of terror, as they continue to shout

"death to America" and call for our destruction and the obliteration of Israel, our greatest ally, how can we trust Iran?

With secret deals, side deals, and self-verification, this President's capitulation will lead to a nuclear Iran for the first time in history and an American endorsement of their efforts to get there.

Well, the Ayatollah has convinced the President that it only needs nuclear capacity for peaceful purposes. But why does Iran need nuclear capacity at all? Iran has the world's fourth largest proven oil reserves, totalling 157 billion barrels of crude oil, and the world's second largest proven natural gas reserves, totalling 1.193 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

With such a robust energy sector, why should Iran, a nation that has consistently defied the international community on this issue, be granted the ability to proceed with a nuclear energy program? Why should we trust Iran? Have they earned the right to be trusted?

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this is a gift to the ayatollahs of Iran. For starters, it releases hundreds of billions of dollars in assets to the regime in Iran, giving them a gift basket full of cash to flood terrorist organizations which seek to harm Americans and our allies.

The deal gives the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism a stamp of legitimacy and the means to expand its destabilizing influence through massive amounts of sanctions relief, even before Iran has demonstrated full adherence to the deal's term. It does, however, bring home the four Americans being imprisoned in Iran.

When questioned as to why, this administration claims that it did not demand the release of American prisoners because it wanted to limit negotiations to just Iran's nuclear program.

On the contrary, Iran won key non-nuclear concessions through the process. The deal grants amnesty to Qasem Soleimani, the head of the Quds force in Iran's Revolutionary Guard, who is one of the world's most leading terrorist masterminds and the man thought responsible for the death of at least 500 United States troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It also lifts the conventional arms embargo on Iran in spite of public testimony from Secretary of Defense Ash Carter and Joint Chiefs Chairman Martin Dempsey that we should do so "under no circumstances."

Lifting this embargo means Iran can begin to stockpile conventional weapons, and Russia and China can begin to legally profit off major weapons exports to Tehran.

Yet perhaps the most troubling aspect of this deal is its inspections regime. Gone are the anytime, anywhere inspections that were required by Congress and outlined by the administration. In its place, a 24-day notice period for Iran, combined with secret side

deals that this Congress has no knowledge of and in which the proponents of the plan are happy to be blissfully ignorant.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this deal know that it does not make us safer or more secure. They know that we cannot trust Iran. They know that the verification process is weak and is built upon secret deals, they know we shouldn't lift the arms embargo, and they know that the hundreds of billions of dollars being released to the Ayatollah will end up on the battlefield in the hands of terrorists who will use it to kill Americans and our allies. Mr. Speaker, they know this is a bad deal.

I'm proud to have my name listed along with Democrats and Republicans in a bipartisan majority opposing this deal.

Mr. Speaker, those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it. In 1994, we heard President Clinton sell his nuclear agreement with North Korea on many of the same talking points President Obama used in his speech to sell this deal with Iran. Yet in 2006, we watched as the North Koreans detonated a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, there is still time to stop this, and I urge—I beg—my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this deal so we aren't watching Iranians detonate their own bomb just a few years from now.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 250

In the Senate of the United States, September 9, 2015.

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker served in the United States Navy during World War II from 1944 to 1946;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker faithfully served the people of Pennsylvania with distinction in the United States Congress;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1960 and served 4 terms as a Representative from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Representative, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States Senate in 1968 and served 2 terms as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Senator, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate;

(2) the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(3) the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities of the Senate; and

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was appointed as the Secretary of Health and Human Services by President Ronald Wilson Reagan in 1981 and served as Secretary of Health and Human Services until 1983: Now, therefore, be it